

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 6, 7 and 9 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The Examiner has stated several times that the specification defines a portal as a collection of data files. Data files represent a structural element and therefore this rejection should be removed.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 7-9 as being obvious over Chipman in view of Krishan. The Examiner continues to point to col. 4, lines 10-17 to state that there are two separate and distinct industry portals. The language cited in col. 4, lines 10-17 relates solely to providing requisite information on its pages to establish a common term for suppliers and consumers to use. The sector portal is so named because each industry sector is contemplated to have at least one government portal from which all portals in that industry sector derive their common vocabulary. The Examiner further cites to col. 14, lines 7-12 to state that manufactured goods can come from several industries or come from service industries. Therefore, all that is taught by Chipman is that each industry may have its own terminology so that searches can be done to find specific items within each portal sector. This assists a user in finding items within that portal. This goes against the teachings of the present invention which allows a user to search between at least two portals. If Chipman were correct there would be different terminology used between each portal and therefore a search could not be done between two portals. The Examiner cites col. 2, lines 46-54 to state that the system integrates the portals so a user can

search and view information relating to both portals in a single system. This again is totally incorrect since a predefined common language is found within each portal. A search cannot be done in a single system for multiple portals. The same can be said for the information cited at col. 3, lines 51-65.

The Examiner agrees that Chipman does not teach information related to a first and second portal is displayed simultaneously. Since Chipman cannot search between more than one portal, Chipman in combination with Krishan cannot display the information from two portals simultaneously.

For the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Claims 2, 7 and 9 are not obvious over the prior art.


With regards to Claim 3, since a portal as defined above represents a structural element, breaking up the portal into specific niches wherein a user can identify information in more specific ways is a functional step and not taught by the prior art.

With regards to Claim 6, for the reasons stated above for Claim 1, Claim 6 is not obvious over the prior art.

Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance.

"EXPRESS MAIL" Mailing Label No. EM 076585024 US
Date of Deposit: April 29, 2008
I hereby certify that this paper (and any document(s) attached herewith
Is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail
Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the
date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner
for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on
April 29, 2008

Signature:
Name:


Debbie Broderick

Respectfully submitted,



Philip M. Weiss
Reg. No. 34,751
Attorney for Applicant
Weiss & Weiss
300 Old Country Rd., Ste. 251
Mineola, NY 11501
(516) 739-1500